

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
OAKLAND DIVISION

FUZZYSHARP TECHNOLOGIES
INCORPORATED,

Plaintiff,

v.

INTEL CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 12-CV-4413 YGR

FINAL JUDGMENT

1
2 On August 22, 2012, Fuzzysharp Technologies Incorporated (“Fuzzysharp”) filed a
3 Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) alleging that Intel Corporation (“Intel”) infringed U.S. Patent Nos.
4 6,172,679 and 6,618,047 (the “’679 patent” and “’047 patent,” respectively). On November 28,
5 2012, Intel filed an Answer and Counterclaims (Dkt. No. 16) that included counterclaims seeking
6 declarations of non-infringement and invalidity of the patents-in-suit.

7 On March 15, 2013, Intel filed a Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings that the 40 claims
8 then asserted by Fuzzysharp are invalid because they do not cover patent-eligible subject matter.
9 Dkt. No. 28; *see also* Dkt. Nos. 32 and 33. On April 29, 2013, the Court converted that motion to
10 a motion for summary judgment and directed the parties to identify any terms or phrases that
11 required construction before a decision on summary judgment. Dkt. No. 45; *see also* Dkt. Nos.
12 47, 48, and 50. On August 9, 2013, Fuzzysharp withdrew all but claims 1, 4, and 5 of the ’679
13 patent and claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 13, 46, 57, 64, 65, and 67 of the ’047 patent (collectively, the
14 “asserted claims”). Dkt. No. 66-2. On September 9, 2013, the parties submitted a Final Joint
15 Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement that narrowed the claims construction issues to two
16 terms. Dkt. No. 64-1.

17 On November 6, 2013, the Court entered an Order construing the two terms that remained
18 in dispute and concluding that the asserted claims do not state eligible subject matter. Dkt. Nos.
19 74-76, “Order.” On December 5, 2013, the parties submitted a stipulation concerning the effect
20 of that order on the pending claims and counterclaims, as well as the disposition of the remaining
21 claims and counterclaims. Dkt. No. 82, “Stipulation.”

22 Pursuant to that Order and Stipulation, the Court now **ENTERS FINAL JUDGMENT** as
23 follows:

24 Claims 1, 4, and 5 of the ’679 patent and claims 1, 8, 11, 12, 13, 46, 57, 64, 65, and 67 of
25 the ’047 patent are invalid under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

26 Intel’s counterclaims for declarations of patent invalidity are **GRANTED** to that extent.

27 Intel’s other counterclaims for declarations for patent invalidity are **DISMISSED**
28 **WITHOUT PREJUDICE AS MOOT.**


1
2 Additionally, the Court now **ENTERS FINAL JUDGMENT** that Intel is not liable for
3 infringement, if any, of the asserted claims. Intel's counterclaims for declaratory judgment of
4 noninfringement are **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE AS MOOT**.

5 This judgment thus disposes of all claims and counterclaims before the Court.

6 This is a final, appealable judgment.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 Dated: December 11, 2013

9
10 
11 Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28